the Interagency Group and the Director of the Institute. In addition, the Institute consults with the Board on the award of fellowships.

The Board will meet in Washington, DC on March 14, 1995 from 10 am to 4 pm. The meeting of the Board is open to the public. The agenda includes a review of 1994 activities, preliminary discussions of potential 1995–1996 NIFL activities, and a discussion on the status of the reauthorization.

Records are kept of all Board proceedings and are available for public inspection at the National Institute for Literacy, 800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 200, Washington, DC 20006 from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 pm.

Andrew J. Hartman,

Executive Director, National Institute for Literacy.

[FR Doc. 95–4955 Filed 2–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6055–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–213

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; Haddam Neck Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–61, issued to Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCO, the licensee), for operation of the Haddam Neck Plant, located in Middlesex County, Connecticut.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

By amendment request dated December 22, 1993, CYAPCO has proposed to revise Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.4.10, ''Structural Integrity,'' Surveillance Requirement 4.4.10. The licensee has proposed an alternate Reactor Coolant Pump (RCP) flywheel inspection frequency and examination methods. The staff has extended the RCP flywheel inspection frequency for RCPs 1 and 2 for one refueling outage until the staff can complete the review for a permanent change.

The Need for the Proposed Action

CYAPCO has determined that the existing RCP flywheel inspection program as discussed in Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.14, ''Reactor Coolant Pump Flywheel Integrity,'' can be optimized by revising the RCP flywheel inspection frequency and examination methods. By optimizing the RCP flywheel inspection program, the licensee will alleviate current testing requirements that are overly restrictive for predicting RCP flywheel integrity and gain increased flexibility in utilizing personnel during subsequent RCP flywheel examinations. This TS change reflects the licensee's proposed alternate RCP flywheel inspection frequency and examination methods. The staff has determined additional information is needed to complete this review, however, the staff has concluded that the request has sufficient merit to extend the TS required inspections for RCPs 1 and 2 for one Cycle.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has reviewed the proposed revision to the TS. The staff has concluded that additional information regarding the proposed inservice examination methods, flaw acceptance criteria, and the supporting fracture mechanics analysis are needed to complete the review. However, the staff has concluded that the proposed TS change involving the changes in TS 3/4.4.10, ''Structural Integrity,'' Surveillance Requirement 4.4.10, can be implemented for Cycle 18 refueling outage as the change would only affect one of the five inspection criteria and two of the four RCPs. In particular, the ultrasonic volumetric inspection frequency for the areas of higher stress concentration for RCPs 1 and 2 be extended for one cycle until the staff can complete the review of the licensee's proposed increased inspection frequency and alternative examination methods for the RCP flywheels. These changes will not affect the desired margins of safety for the two affected accidents: (1) RCP locked rotor event, and (2) adequacy of missile protection inside containment and, therefore, the extension of the inspection interval by one refueling cycle is acceptable. This conclusion is based on the flaw history of the RCP flywheels and the likelihood that the most recent inspections would have detected any flaws of structural significance.

The proposed TS change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with this proposed TS amendment.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed amendment does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological or nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed amendment, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not considered previously in the Final Environmental Statement for the Haddam Neck Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed amendment.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated December 22, 1993, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public Document room located at the Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06547.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ronald W. Hernan,

Acting Director, Project Directorate I–4, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–4975 Filed 2–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–413]

Duke Power Company, et al., Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), Type A Tests, to the Duke Power Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, located in York County, South Carolina, in accordance with Facility Operating License No. NFP–35.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of October 18, 1994, as supplemented on February 7, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to the extent that a one-time schedular extension would permit rescheduling the third containment integrated leak rate test (ILRT) in the first 10-year service period from the end-of-Cycle 8 outage until the end-of-Cycle 9 outage. The requested exemption would also allow the decoupling of this third test from the endpoint of the first 10-year inservice inspection.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The current containment integrated leakage rate (ILRT) requirements for Catawba Units 1 and 2, pursuant to Appendix J, are that, after the preoperational leak rate test, a set of three Type A tests must be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year period. Also, the third test of each set must be conducted when the plant is shut down for the 10-year plant inservice inspection. This is reflected in the Catawba Technical Specifications (TS) as a testing interval of once each 40 months plus or minus 10 months, for a frequency of three times in a 120-month period. To date, for Catawba Unit 1, the preoperational and the first two periodic ILRTs have been conducted. The most recent ILRT was conducted in March 1991, approximately 47 months ago. Thus, in accordance with Appendix J and the current TS, and ILRT would have to be conducted during the refueling outage beginning in February 1995 (the end-of-cycle (EOC) 8 outage).

The licensee has requested an exemption from Appendix J and a corresponding change to the TS that would allow a one-time change to the interval for the Unit 1 ILRT from 40 plus or minus 10 months to 60 plus or minus 10 months (once each 5 years). This would allow the EOC–8 ILRT to be rescheduled for EOC–9. Therefore, the need for the licensee's proposed action is to allow a longer interval between the Catawba Unit 1 second and third periodic Type A ILRTs which will result in a cost savings to the licensee.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The proposed one-time exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the results of previous Type A tests performed at the Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1. The licensee has provided an acceptable basis for concluding that the proposed one-time extension of the Type A test interval would maintain the containment leakage rates within acceptable limits. Accordingly, the Commission has concluded that the one-time extension does not result in a significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released nor does it result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption only involves Type A testing on the containment. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed exemption, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to this action would be to deny the request for exemption. Such action would not reduce the environmental impacts of plant operations.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in the ''Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Catawba Nuclear Station Unit No. 1,'' dated January 1983.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the NRC staff consulted with the South Carolina State official regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated October 18, 1994, as supplemented February 7, 1995, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herbert N. Berkow,

Director, Project Directorate II–3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–4976 Filed 2–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Pubic Law 97–415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission on NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97–415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the